

Report the United States informed the Court that it had filed its brief on just compensation on January 28, 2020.

4. The status conference was held on February 25, 2020. During the status conference the United States informed the Court that it had already filed its brief on the issue of just compensation. Defendant, Friends of Wildlife Corridor, had not yet filed their brief. Accordingly and during the hearing, the Court ordered only the Defendant to file their brief on the issue of just compensation within 7 days, i.e., by March 3, 2020.

5. At the conclusion of the February 25th status conference the United States believed it had fulfilled all its obligations in regards to the just compensation briefing due to the fact that the United States had already filed its brief on just compensation and, during the conference, the United States was not ordered to file a second brief on the issue during the hearing.

6. However, in this Court's Order of June 16, 2020, the Court orders both parties to show cause for their failure to file the just compensation briefing. Counsel for the United States is confused because the discussion during the February 25th status concerned whether Defendant would file a brief on just compensation, as the United States had complied with its filing requirement per the Court's Order of December 30, 2019.

7. After reviewing this Court's Order of June 16th, the United States reviewed the Minute Entry for the February 25th status conference. Upon re-reviewing the Minute Entry the United States realizes that the Minute Entry states that both parties are ordered to file a brief. But, as stated above, counsel for the United States understood, based on the Court's instruction during the February 25, 2020 hearing that it was not required to file a second brief on the issue of just compensation. The United States acknowledges that it should have sought clarification of the Minute Entry from the Court and counsel for the United States regrets the misunderstanding.

8. Defendant did not believe that filing a brief on just compensation was required if it did not wish to contest the United States' position on just compensation. During the February 25, 2020 status conference, Defendant believes it advised the Court that it lacked evidence to rebut the United States' claims on just compensation. Thus, Defendant understood that the Court, through the Minute Entry, was providing the Defendant additional time to hire an expert and file a response. Defendant, however, concluded that it did not wish to contest the United States' brief on just compensation for the reasons below.

9. Defendant advises the Court that the property at issue in this case is in the process of being sold to the United States Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS). The sale is not yet finalized. But the Defendant and USFWS have reach an agreement on the sales price and terms. Defendant decided that it did not wish to invest additional resources in this matter in light of the pending sale.⁶ The parties should have advised the Court earlier that there was no dispute on the issue of just compensation. However, finalizing the agreement and pleadings were delayed, in part, due to COVID-19 related restrictions.

10. On June 17, 2020, the parties filed a Joint Motion for Order Establishing Distribution of Funds on Deposit in the Registry of the Court, and Closing Case.⁷

11. As stated in the Joint Motion for Order, the parties agreed the deposited amount of \$100 as estimated just compensation was adequate just compensation for the 12 month temporary easement on Tract RGV-MCS-1215.

⁶ The pending sale does not moot this case. Defendant is still entitled to compensation for the temporary easement acquired.

⁷ Dkt. No. 22

12. In light of the parties' agreement, the parties now seek Court guidance as to the issue of Defendant being required to file a brief on just compensation and the United States being required to file a second brief on just compensation.

13. Should the Court deem this Joint Status Report an adequate explanation regarding the required briefing on just compensation, the parties believe the Joint Motion for Order Establishing Distribution of Funds on Deposit in the Registry of the Court, and Closing Case will resolve all remaining disputes in this matter.

Respectfully submitted,

THE MOORE LAW FIRM

4900 North 10th Street, Suite F-3

McAllen, Texas 78504

Telephone: (956) 631-0745

Telecopier: (888) 266-0971

Email: lit-docket@moore-firm.com;

paul@gaytanlaw.com

By: *s/ Paul Gaytan (with permission)*

Paul Gaytan

State Bar No. 24007233

Southern District Bar No. 23940

Attorney for Defendant

RYAN K. PATRICK

United States Attorney

Southern District of Texas

s/ Hilda M. Garcia Concepcion

HILDA M. GARCIA CONCEPCION

Assistant United States Attorney

Southern District of Texas

Texas No. 3399716

1701 W. Bus. Highway 83, Suite 600

McAllen, TX 78501

Telephone: (956) 618-8004

Facsimile: (956) 618-8016

E-mail: Hilda.Garcia.Concepcion@usdoj.gov

JIMMY A. RODRIGUEZ

Assistant United States Attorney

Southern District of Texas No. 24037378

Federal ID No. 572175

1000 Louisiana, Suite 2300

Houston, TX 77002

Telephone: (713) 567-9532

Facsimile: (713) 718-3303

E-mail: jimmy.rodriguez2@usdoj.gov

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I certify that on June 26, 2020, a copy of the foregoing was electronically filed in the CM/ECF system, which will automatically serve a Notice of Electronic Filing on counsel of record.

By: *s/ Hilda M. Garcia Concepcion*
HILDA M. GARCIA CONCEPCION
Assistant United States Attorney